

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-4 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 3 and 4 are amended to overcome a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Shakeri at the interview held September 20, 2004, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 since the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance (for the reasons discussed herein); (b) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration; (c) satisfy a requirement of form asserted in the previous Office Action; (d) do not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; and (e) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The amendments are necessary and were not earlier presented because they are made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

**I. Interview Summary**

Applicants' representative and Examiner Shakeri conducted an interview on September 20, 2004. However, no Interview Summary has been mailed. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request an Interview Summary to be mailed by the Patent Office.

**II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph**

Claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Patent Office specifically alleged that claims 3 and 4 do not recite method steps. Applicants disagree with this allegation. However, solely to expedite the prosecution of this application, Applicants have amended claims 3 and 4 as suggested by the Patent Office.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that this rejection is now moot. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are thus respectfully requested.

**III. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

Claims 1, 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,053,971 ("Wood"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Patent Office alleges that Wood teaches all of the features recited in claims 1, 3 and 4. The Patent Office particularly alleges that controlling the turning speed of the revolving machining tool is taught by Wood.

However, Applicants submit that Wood does not teach or suggest (1) setting the turning speed of the revolving machining tool according to lens material and lens thickness as recited in claim 1 and (2) changing the turning speed of the revolving machining tool as recited in claims 3 and 4.

The Patent Office alleges that Wood's teachings that "that the lens edging apparatus will automatically set up the proper speed and feed rate for the material selected" (see column 10, lines 25-29) equates to controlling the turning speed of the revolving machining tool. However, this statement is extremely ambiguous and does not specify whether the speed rate and feed rate are related to the rotation of the lens blank or the multi-insert cutter, which correlates to the revolving machining tool.

If anything, it would appear that the speed rate and feed rate are related to the rotation of the lens blank. Wood extensively teaches how the lens is rotated by the lens rotation drive transfer system. See columns 5-8 of Wood. Furthermore, the lens is edged by moving the rotating lens toward and away from the multi-insert cutter. See column 8, lines 49-53 of Wood. Moreover, Wood does not teach or suggest changing the turning speed of the multi-insert cutter.

Wood merely teaches the rotation of the lens by the rotation drive transfer system, not the turning of the multi-insert cutter. In other words, Wood does not teach or suggest setting the turning speed of the revolving machining tool according to the lens material and lens thickness as required by claim 1 and changing the turning speed of the revolving machining tool as required by claims 3 and 4.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that Wood does not teach or suggest all of the features recited in claims 1, 3 and 4. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are thus requested.

**IV. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Wood in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,074,280 ("Mizuno"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Patent Office admits that Wood does not teach or a control information processing apparatus having a machining condition changing function for setting different machining conditions for rough machining and for finishing machining after the rough machining by changing the turning speed of the revolving machining tool as recited in claim 2. Therefore, the Patent Office has introduced Mizuno as allegedly teaching setting the speed in reference to the material used or the input processing condition, and setting a different speed for rough or finishing machining. Applicants respectfully disagree with this allegation.

The Patent Office has further implied that the finishing machining recited in claim 2 is equivalent to the mirror finishing taught by Mizuno. Applicants strenuously disagree with this implication. The finishing machining recited in claim 2 is in fact equivalent to the finishing process taught by Mizuno.

Finishing machining and mirror finishing are two entirely separate processes as is known in the art and disclosed by Mizuno. The finishing process is done when the rough

process has ended. See column 9, lines 3-4 of Mizuno. Once the finishing process is completed, the process advances to the mirror finishing process. See column 9, lines 24-25 of Mizuno. Thus, it is clear that the finishing process and the mirror finishing process are two completely separate processes.

Claim 2 requires setting different machining conditions for rough machining and for finishing machining after the rough machining by changing the turning speed of the revolving machining tool. Mizuno does not teach or suggest conducting the rough process and finishing process (the mirror finishing process of Mizuno is not relevant as discussed above) by turning the grinding wheel at different speeds.

In this regard, Mizuno teaches that the turning speed of the grinding wheel (i.e., revolving machining tool) remains the same during the rough process and the finishing process. See, for example, Figs. 9 and 10, column 9, lines 49-51 and column 10, lines 22-25 of Mizuno. It nowhere teaches or suggests setting different machining conditions for rough machining and finishing machining by changing a turning speed of the revolving machining tool as recited in claim 2

Thus, even if Wood and Mizuno were combined, the apparatus recited in claim 2 would not have been achieved. In particular, neither Wood nor Mizuno, in combination or alone, teach or suggest a control information processing apparatus having a machining condition changing function for setting different machining conditions for rough machining and for finishing machining after the rough machining by changing the turning speed of the revolving machining tool as recited in claim 2.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that Wood and/or Mizuno do not teach or suggest all of the features recited in claim 2. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are thus respectfully requested.

**V. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-4 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

*Leana Levin*

James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Leana Levin  
Registration No. 51,939

JAO:LL/hs

Date: April 29, 2005

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--